The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON GROUNDS AND BUILDINGS
June 30, 2004

A Special Meeting of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings was held on the above date at 1000 Broadway, Oakland.

Members present: Regents Johnson, Kozberg, Marcus, Montoya, Murray, and Seigler; Advisory members Anderson and Pitts

In attendance: Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Holst, Senior Vice President Mullinix, Chancellor Tomlinson-Keasey, and Recording Secretary Bryan

The meeting convened at 11:15 a..m. with Committee Chair Marcus presiding.

1. **READING OF NOTICE OF MEETING**

For the record, it was confirmed that notice had been given in accordance with the Bylaws and Standing Orders of The Regents for a Special Meeting of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, for this date and time, for the purpose of addressing items on the Committee's agenda.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of April 14, 2004 were approved.

3. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, RANCH VIEW TERRACE FACULTY AND STAFF HOUSING, SANTA CRUZ CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as indicated in the Environmental Impact Report, the Committee:

(1) Certify the Environmental Impact Report.

(2) Adopt the Findings and Mitigation Monitoring Program.

(3) Approve the design of the Ranch View Terrace Faculty and Staff Housing project, Santa Cruz campus.

(4) Authorize the President or his designee to approve the Ranch View Terrace Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and to sign the Implementing Agreement (IA).

(5) Authorize the President or his designee to amend the 1988 UCSC Long Range Development Plan in conjunction with approval of the HCP/IA, involving no more acres of the Campus Habitat Reserve than currently contemplated (25 acres total: 13 acres in Inclusion Area A and 12.5 acres in Inclusion Area D).

[The Environmental Impact Report, Findings, and Mitigation Monitoring Program were mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

It was recalled that the Ranch View Terrace Faculty and Staff Housing project is a third-party development to plan, finance, construct, and sell 80 single-family dwelling units on Santa Cruz campus land through a license agreement and lot leases. The third party will also develop a community center with four attached apartments and other common area improvements that will be transferred to and managed by the University under terms of the development agreement. The project is intended to address an important LRDP element to provide affordable on-campus faculty and staff housing at below-market sales prices.

Following the project construction, UCSC Colleges and University Housing Services will be responsible for the maintenance of the community center and the leasing of apartments. Specific terms of the agreement with the third-party developer and the lot leases will be submitted to The Regents for approval at the July 2004 meeting.

A Ranch View Terrace Habitat Conservation Plan is being developed by the campus to support an application to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for an Incidental Take Permit under the Federal Endangered Species Act. USFWS action on the HCP application will be made final at a later time. The HCP/IA will be forwarded to the President for approval.

Project Site

The proposed project is consistent with the land use assumptions and planning principles set forth in the Santa Cruz Campus LRDP for Inclusion Areas. This housing development will be near other existing faculty and staff homes and apartments at the base of the campus. The main building site occupies approximately 12.96 acres on the southern edge of the Santa Cruz campus, immediately west of the main campus entrance. Two additional sites for the relocation of existing UCSC Farm plots occupy about 6 acres.

The main building site is set on sloping grasslands bordered by the Arboretum and the Center for Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems (the Farm). An open space to the northeast is designated “protected landscape” in the LRDP. Campus and community support facilities and an overlay district identified in the LRDP as an “historic area” are located to the east of the site, where the project is set back and buffered by low-level vegetation. Taller homes are set back from the southern and eastern edges of the development to lessen the project profile. Two seasonal seeps located in the area will be protected.

Project Design

The project will consist of 80 two- and three-story, below-market value, single-family dwelling units for sale to faculty and staff. The proposed unit mix includes 42 three-bedroom and 38 four-bedroom homes ranging in size from 1,760 to 2,050 square feet. Each home will have a two-vehicle carport and a fenced private yard. The residential units and carports will be organized into 12 clusters of five to eight residences, each located along a paved loop access road.

The project will include a 1,500-square-foot community center for the use of the residents, with four one-bedroom apartments for lease. An adjacent outdoor play area will accommodate social activities. An informal grassland is planned to run through the center of the main building site, providing additional play and recreation areas. A portion of the building site adjacent to the Farm will be developed into a community garden, outdoor meeting space, and play area. Bike paths, pedestrian ways, and proximity to campus and municipal bus stops provide convenient access to the central campus core and adjoining neighborhoods.

Massing, style, roof forms, fenestration patterns, and siding materials are designed to achieve a rural vernacular architectural style that will complement buildings in the adjacent historic area. Exterior siding and trim will be painted cement board; roofing will be composition shingles. Materials and colors will mimic elements of the natural surroundings. Sustainability and energy efficiency are inherent in the home designs. In addition, the developer is evaluating further options for conservation that may be offered to homebuyers.

The third-party developer will manage the project through construction, marketing, and completion of sales. A University representative will assure that construction is completed in accordance with the approved plans. An outside plan-checking and inspection consultant will review all work associated with the above-ground development, and campus staff will review common area construction documents and below-grade construction.

Environmental Impact Summary

An Environmental Impact Report that was prepared for the proposed Ranch View Terrace Faculty and Staff Housing project contains the public comments received, campus responses, and a mitigation monitoring program. The issues and concerns raised most frequently in the comments and testimony received by the campus included the analysis of or mitigation for cumulative traffic impacts; visual impacts of the proposed project on the Arboretum; land use conflicts with the Arboretum and the UCSC Farm; impacts on agricultural resources associated with relocation of the farm plots; impacts on wildlife habitat; and increased stormwater runoff that would result from the project. The EIR determined impacts to be less than significant in most categories and identified potentially significant impacts in a few areas that could be reduced to less-than-significant levels through the implementation of mitigation measures. The EIR did not identify any

significant unavoidable project-level impacts associated with the development of the Ranch View Terrace project.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's impacts, mitigation measures, and conclusions regarding certification of the EIR for the project, in conformance with CEQA.

Habitat Conservation Plan Summary

The Ranch View Terrace Habitat Conservation Plan is proposing to set aside 25.5 acres of campus land to compensate for the potential effects on two federally listed species and associated habitat at and around the proposed project site. The HCP describes monitoring and reporting requirements associated with the implementation of the program. It is proposed to authorize the President to approve the HCP and related LRDP amendments. The HCP and the accompanying Implementing Agreement between The Regents and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service outline the conservation measures intended to mitigate impacts from the proposed projects specifically on the California red-legged frog and Ohlone tiger beetle. The Implementing Agreement will serve as a contract between The Regents and the USFWS, specifying the rights and obligations of each party.

Vice Chancellor Vani and Assistant Vice Chancellor Zwart presented slides of the project.

In response to a question by Committee Chair Marcus, Vice Chancellor Vani indicated that financing arrangements for the project would be presented at a later date. He informed Regent Montoya that the housing would be allocated in accordance with a policy developed by the Faculty Welfare Committee. If there are insufficient ladder-rank faculty to fill the project, units will be offered to staff.

In response to a question by Regent Murray, Assistant Vice Chancellor Zwart acknowledged that the view from the Arboretum to the ocean would be compromised, but he noted that care was taken to space the new buildings so as to retain some open views.

Regent Kozberg was complimentary about the design.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation.

(For speakers' comments, refer to the June 30 minutes of the Committee of the Whole.)

4. **CERTIFICATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AMENDMENT OF MASTER PAN, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, UNIVERSITY VILLAGE REDEVELOPMENT STEP 2 PROJECT, BERKELEY CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as indicated in the Subsequent Focused EIR, the Committee:

(1) Certify the Environmental Impact Report.

(2) Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring Program, Findings, and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

(3) Approve the Master Plan as amended.

(4) Approve the design of the University Village Redevelopment Step 2 project, Berkeley campus.

(5) Authorize the President or his designee to modify the University Village Master Plan, if required, provided that any substantial changes in principles or policies be brought to The Regents for approval.

[The Environmental Impact Report, Mitigation Monitoring Program, Findings, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Master Plan were mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

It was recalled that in November 2003, The Regents approved the University Village Redevelopment Step 2 project, Berkeley campus for inclusion in the 2003-04 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program at a cost of $116,500,000. The project's budget and scope were amended subsequently to include 24 additional one-bedroom housing units, based on a request at the February 18, 2004 Committee on Grounds and Building meeting to increase the project's density. The revised total project cost of $118,795,000 will be funded from external financing ($112,200,000) and the Berkeley campus' share of the UC Housing System Net Revenue Fund ($6,595,000). Payment of the debt service will be from the Berkeley campus' share of UCHS annual net revenues.

In October 2003, the Office of the President approved the appointment of J.R. Roberts Corporation of Citrus Heights as Design-Builder for the project.

Project Site

The 77-acre project site is located three miles northwest of the Berkeley campus and lies entirely within the city limits of Albany. It is bounded by San Pablo Avenue, the U.S. Department of Agriculture offices and research facilities, Ocean View Elementary School, Village Creek, Buchanan Street, Cordonices Creek, and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks.

Master Plan Amendment

The 1998 Master Plan approved by The Regents for University Village envisioned the Village would be redeveloped in three steps, the first of which, completed in August 2000, replaced most of 1940s-era housing units and a portion of 1960s-era units with 392 new student family units. The scope of work for Steps 2 and 3, which will be guided by the amended Master Plan, will include the following:

- Demolition of the 412 existing 1960s housing units in the Step 2 area;
- Demolition of the 152 existing 1940s housing units and other existing structures in the Step 3 area;
- Construction of new student family housing in the Step 2 area;
- Construction of new housing for faculty and for graduate students without children in the Step 3 area;
- Construction of new facilities including a community center, infant and child care center, and little league fields in the Step 3 area, and a maintenance facility in the Step 2 area;
- Construction of community-serving retail space in mixed-use buildings along the San Pablo and Monroe Avenue frontages in Step 3.

The 1998 Master Plan maintained the on-site agricultural research on the Gill Tract. The amended Master Plan requires demolition of the existing facilities and redevelopment of the Gill Tract for housing, open space, and recreational uses.

The new Master Plan increases the amount of open space and recreational amenities beyond what was envisioned in the 1998 Master Plan. Pedestrian and bicycle trails will connect throughout the project site and provide improved access to amenities, including improved sections of Codornices and Village creeks that run through University Village. Modern multi-family development concepts are designed to improve the quality of life for residents in University Village. The site plan and buildings are designed to create a sense of privacy, define public versus private areas, and provide protection from street traffic. Building courtyards are designed to meet the needs of families with children, with semi-private open spaces to create opportunities for the residents to socialize.

Project Design

The Step 2 housing project builds on the attributes of the adjoining Step 1 development by replacing the confusing existing layout with a more regular block pattern for clear way finding and improved safety for children. The new plan creates a village ambiance, with tree-lined sidewalks and curbside parking, while landscaped courtyards, similar in scale to Step 1, provide semi-private open space for the tenants. A greenway for pedestrian and bicycle access curves through the entire Village, connecting Step 1 and its community center with Step 2 and with the community gardens at the west end of the site.

The basic building module in Step 2 is a three-story “house” comprised of 24 units. The larger 3-bedroom units are at grade, with the 2-bedroom units stacked above, creating one-story corner elements that diminish the overall scale of the building forms. The

buildings are connected with short bridges to create blocks; the bridge structures define gateways to the landscaped interior courtyards framed by the buildings.

The Step 2 buildings have many of the same architectural features as Step 1, including bay windows, a variety of pitched roof forms, and diversity in building textures and colors. Parking is accommodated along the streets as well as in nine small auto courts. Exterior walls will be sheathed in plywood, glass-fiber mat gypsum, building paper, and fiber cement. The roofs will be finished with composite shingles. The stacked interior unit plans contribute to superior seismic restraint characteristics.

The Step 2 site and buildings have been designed to meet the minimum standard equivalent to the LEED's certified rating as well as to exceed the California Energy Code Title 24 efficiency standard. The campus has reviewed the design and structures. Independent structural review will be conducted at each stage of the project development. UCB Facility Services and the design-build team will manage the project, supplemented by outside consultants and testing agencies as necessary. The Vice Chancellor, UCB Facilities Services, will perform project oversight

.

Environmental Impact Summary

A Subsequent Focused Environmental Impact Report was prepared for the proposed amendments to the University Village & Albany-Northwest Berkeley Properties Master Plan. An Initial Study was prepared to identify the scope and focus of the Subsequent Focused EIR. The Draft EIR drew oral testimony from 30 people and 154 letters during the review period. An additional 117 form letters and 496 signed petitions were received supporting the preservation of the Gill Tract for agricultural-related activities.

The East Bay Municipal Utilities District commented on the availability of waste water capacity to serve the project and its policies for providing water service to projects and for installing water lines in areas identified as containing soil or groundwater contamination. The Alameda County Congestion Management Agency identified the need for additional measures to mitigate traffic impacts on certain roadways and intersections, provided edits and corrections to the traffic analysis, and advised of the need to address bicycle and pedestrian impacts and funding of mitigation measures. The City of Albany commented on the loss of revenues and development impact fees that will result from the project, fire response time to the three-to-four-story buildings, the increase in calls for Albany Fire service, actual versus projected University Village population, increase in peak hour traffic caused by construction vehicles, economic and social effects from the loss of affordable housing units, the visual impacts of building height and design along San Pablo Avenue, and the impact of the loss of the Gill Tract from a social standpoint and as an environmental amenity. The City of Berkeley commented on the increased need for Berkeley's public services, especially on its police and fire departments and recreation facilities, and requested that direct financial payments be made to the City to support these services. Other concerns are the project's contribution to existing downstream flooding, the project's potential conflict with emergency evacuation, and University Village residents' exposure to existing air pollutants from

industrial uses and mobile sources in the area. Additionally, the City objects to the opening of 10th Street, does not support a mitigation measure to work with the University to install a signal at Harrison and San Pablo, and wants the University to contribute to area-wide traffic improvements at major intersections and at all adjacent intersections where unacceptable service levels are created.

Many community members and the ASUC comment letters state a desire to have the University preserve the Gill Tract for agricultural-related education and community activities. Other comments were made regarding the compatibility of the four-story buildings along San Pablo Avenue with other San Pablo Avenue developments and with the community in general, the potential destruction of an historic and agricultural resource by developing the Gill Tract, impacts on wildlife species from development of the Gill Tract, air quality impacts from construction and long-term traffic, and public safety impacts from increased traffic.

The Village Residents Association commented on the inequity in the provision of educational support that will be created by displacing very low-income student families, on overcrowded conditions in housing units, and on the impacts on parking and traffic control in the Village and surrounding community. It also commented on creating greater service needs within the Village and surrounding community as housing costs exceed household incomes and the households are less able to pay for needed education, health, and recreational family support activities.

The Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures section of the EIR lists the potential environmental impacts of the proposed projects, and the proposed mitigation measures. The Subsequent Focused EIR identifies significant and unavoidable impacts from the proposed project. Mitigation measures will reduce some of the impacts, but not to less-than-significant levels. The final EIR is accompanied by a Mitigation Monitoring Program to assure that all mitigation measures are implemented in accordance with CEQA.

Findings

The Findings discuss the University Village project's impacts, mitigation measures, and conclusions regarding certification of the EIR for the project in conformance with CEQA.

Assistant Vice Chancellors Lollini and LeGrande presented slides of the project.

In response to questions by Regent Johnson, Mr. LeGrande noted that about 23 percent of the housing in the Village will have below-market rents, with a fixed scale for rent increases; Mr. Lollini commented that the Village accounts for under 5 percent of emergency service calls for fire department assistance; and Mr. LeGrande reported that a child-care center will be added to the project later. He assured Regent Kozberg that the impact of the addition of Village children on local schools would be minimal.

Regent Seigler also asked about emergency services for the Village. Mr. Lollini commented that the University does not have direct agreements with Albany and Berkeley for the provision of fire services, but provides its own police services and has contributed to the cities in ways such as gifting property to Albany for a school. Senior Vice President Mullinix emphasized the fact that, although the University does not generally reimburse cities for services to its campus communities, it contributes to their wellbeing in many other ways. He noted that the retail element planned for Step 3 will generate sales tax for Albany.

Regent Murray expressed concern about keeping rents affordable. In response to a question he asked about the Gill Tract, Mr. Lollini explained that the plot is not considered sufficiently pristine or useful for research by the College of Agriculture.

Regent Montoya noted that in a letter concerning the fiscal impacts of the project on the City, the Mayor notes that Albany is not in a position to benefit from the University's presence in that the main campus is in Berkeley. She was hopeful that the campus would provide an adequate response.

Regent-designate Anderson also expressed concern about affordability. She advocated informing students, perhaps through a website, about how to plan for managing their housing costs and about their options for receiving financial help.

Regent Kozberg was complimentary about the plan, which she believed would contribute to its surrounding area in positive ways.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation, Regent Murray abstaining.

Associate Secretary Shaw drew attention to the report of communications received pertaining to this item and to item 3.

(For speakers' comments, refer to the minutes of the June 30 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.)

5. **CERTIFICATION OF FOCUSED TIERED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AMENDMENT OF THE LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, EDUCATION BUILDING, MEDICAL CENTER, DAVIS CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project as indicated in the Environmental Impact Report, the Committee recommend that The Regents:

A. Certify the Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report.

B. Amend the UCDMC Long Range Development Plan to include the project site by changing 2.7 acres from Mixed Use to Instruction and Research.

C. Adopt the Findings.

D. Approve the design of the Education Building, Medical Center, Davis campus.

[The Focused Tiered Environmental Impact Report and Findings were mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

It was recalled that the Education Building will provide needed teaching and student support space at the UC Davis Medical Center campus in Sacramento, correct deficiencies identified in accreditation surveys, enhance collaboration with other UC campuses, increase space for research undertaken with other organizations, and facilitate the removal of buildings that must be relocated or demolished in order to complete major capital improvements related to seismic safety compliance.

In October 2003, the Office of the President approved the appointment of RNL Design of Los Angeles as Executive Architect for the project, the construction of which will begin in January 2005, with occupancy planned for May 2006.

Project Site

The Education Building will be built on a 2.7-acre site on the Medical Center campus, located at the southeast corner of the intersection of X Street and 45th Street. This visually prominent site is located across the intersection from the main hospital and the future Surgery and Emergency Services Pavilion. Surrounding land uses include the existing Cancer Center, the Administrative Support Building, the Clinical Laboratory Building, and the Shriners Hospital. The project proposes an LRDP amendment to change 2.7 acres of land from Mixed Use to Instruction and Research.

Project Description

The four-story, 122,022-gross-square-foot building is clad primarily in precast concrete, with metal panels and aluminum window sashes and detailing. The exterior materials, landscaping, and site furnishings have been chosen for compatibility with the surrounding buildings and to be consistent with current campus standards for materials and color. A primary feature of the building is an open-air walkway through its center that will be the major pedestrian connection between the Main Hospital building to the northwest and the Ellison Ambulatory Care Center to the east. The north wing of the building provides classrooms and lecture halls; the south wing provides space for the library, administrative offices, and other educational activities. Some classrooms will be configured for state-of-the-art medical technology teaching, while other space will be designed for small groups. Student support services and the Dean's Office will be housed in the building.

The master plan for the project site anticipates the potential addition of a second phase building of approximately 50,000 gsf. Any future phase will be contingent upon programmatic considerations, the identification of a funding source, and Regental approval.

The UC Davis Medical Center's Facilities Design and Construction Department will manage the project, with assistance from the executive architect's project team. Outside consultants and testing agencies will be used as necessary. The UCDHS Executive Director for Planning, Design and Construction will perform project oversight.

Environmental Impact Summary

Comments received during the review period for the Draft Focused Tiered EIR for the project, and the campus' responses to them, are included in the Final Focused Tiered EIR.

The EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts in the areas of transportation, circulation, and air quality that are due to cumulative regional growth in traffic and the resultant degradation in air quality. The project contributes only incrementally to these impacts. All other impacts due to the project are less than significant. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan has been prepared and is included as a part of this action to monitor mitigation measures.

Findings

The Findings discuss the impacts, mitigation measures, and conclusions regarding certification of the environmental documentation for the project in conformance with CEQA.

Executive Director Boyd and Manager Rush presented slides of the project.

Regent Murray appreciated the fact that energy concerns had been addressed in the project. He believed that the Medical Center should apply for rebates for energy savings

from the City and County of Sacramento. He noted that the building's flat roof is appropriate for accommodating future energy-saving technologies.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation.

[At this point, Regent Kozberg left the meeting in order to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest.]

6. **ADOPTION OF NEGATIVE DECLARATION, AMENDMENT OF LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND APPROVAL OF DESIGN, LOGISTICAL SUPPORT-SERVICE FACILITIES BUILDING, MERCED CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, upon review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed action as evaluated in the Tiered Initial Study, the Committee:

A. Adopt the Negative Declaration.

B. Approve and incorporate into the project of all project elements and the relevant 2001 campus Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report Mitigation Measures.

C. Adopt the Findings in their entirety.

D. Amend the 2001 campus Long Range Development Plan to change 1.44 acres from Academic Core to Campus Support.

E. Approve the design of the Logistical Support/Service Facilities, Merced campus.

[The Negative Declaration, Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report Mitigation Measures, Findings, and Long Range Development Plan were mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

It was recalled that The Regents had approved the Logistical Support-Service Facilities (LSSF) project in 2003. Its $10,164,000 cost will be funded by the State General Obligation Bond. In April 2004, the Office of the President approved the appointment of RNL Design of Los Angeles, CA, as Executive Architect.

Project Site

The 1.44-acre site for the facility is located in the northeast region of the Phase 1 campus, near the Corporation Yard Building, the Central Plant Building, and agriculture grazing land.

LRDP Amendment

The 2001 LRDP will be amended to change the designation of the LSSF site from Academic Core to Campus Support. The project was originally set for the southwestern corner of the Phase1 campus, on a parcel designated for Campus Support. Following more detailed planning, it was determined that a site closer to the Central Plant would be more appropriate.

Project Design

The Logistical Support-Service Facilities building is designed to contain 20,600 assignable square feet of offices, shops and storage space, and Environment, Health and Safety (EHS) operations space. The project has a one-story north EHS wing and a two-story south wing for offices and shops that respond to the sloping site and create a clear separation of the EHS hazardous material handling areas from the rest of the facility.

The building is a wood frame structure with steel components for bracing and the support of the air-handling units. The exterior is clad in stucco or fiber cement board, with factory finished aluminum windows and energy-efficient, dual pane low-e glazing. The exterior walls of the first level are poured-in-place concrete. A "light shelf" will be used to increase the amount of daylight into the interior. The building completes a defined group that includes the Corporation Yard Building and Central Plant Building.

The campus has conducted a peer design review and an independent cost review of the Logistical Support-Service Facilities Building. The Physical Planning Office, with oversight of the Vice Chancellor--Administration, will manage this project.

Environmental Impact Summary

A Tiered Initial Study and proposed Negative Declaration for the project evaluates the project's potential air quality and hazardous materials impacts. The Initial Study concludes that the project would incrementally contribute to, but would not exceed, certain significant LRDP-level and cumulative impacts previously identified in the 2001 LRDP EIR, and that for such impacts, no mitigation measures other than those previously identified in the 2001 LRDP EIR are required. These mitigation measures will be monitored pursuant to the existing 2001 LRDP EIR monitoring program.

Findings

The Findings discuss the project's impacts and evidence that the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

Chancellor Tomlinson-Keasey, Vice Chancellor Desrochers, and Campus Architect Smith presented slides of the project.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation. Regent Kozberg did not participate in the discussion nor vote on the action in order to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest.

[At this point, Regent Kozberg rejoined the meeting.]

7. **UCSF MISSION BAY 17C CANCER CENTER, SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS**

Vice Chancellor Barclay presented the preliminary proposal for the design of the Cancer Center at Mission Bay. He noted that the financing plan for the project, which will be submitted at the September Regents meeting, will include $122 million of the capital budget consisting of $15 million of campus reserves, $22 million of debt, and $85 million of gift financing, $70 million of which are in hand. He noted that the need for clinical space is vital for the Mission Bay campus.

Associate Vice Chancellor Wiesenthal discussed the building's design, which is consistent with the Master Plan and will not result in any new significant environmental impacts. The UCSF Design Advisory Committee has approved the schematic design, which has been supported by many community advisory groups. The architect for the 160,000-gross-square-foot, five-story building is Rafael Vignoli, working with GPR laboratory planners and Gicklehorn Lazzarotto Partners. Mr. Wiesenthal showed slides to illustrate the building plan. The site is at the northeastern corner of the campus.

Mr. Wiesenthal recalled that the campus uses four guiding principles that have informed UCSF's plans and projects, and he highlighted how they have been applied to this project. Building shapes form open spaces within a hierarchy of larger, communal open spaces and smaller courtyards that make visual and physical connections among buildings and landscape. The connections to the Cancer Center establish a relationship among pathways, landscape, building entrances, and primary interior and exterior gathering spaces. The principle of cohesiveness is illustrated in the campus' first three laboratory buildings, which share material and color palettes, sculptural roofscapes, and demarcated cornices that refer to classical architecture. The new building will relate to its immediate context as well as to the other building types on the campus. Sustainability, another guiding principle, is made manifest by the fact that the Cancer Center will be Mission Bay's first LEED-certifiable research laboratory building.

Mr. Wiesenthal described the building's floor plan. The building blends the work of wet-bench scientists, computational-based researchers, and translational researchers to focus

on new discoveries about cancer in what will be the first clinically-based laboratory at Mission Bay. A series of interlocking Ls surround a vertical circulation space that promote collegiality and offer flexibility to accommodate future trends in research. The faculty requested the campus to push the boundaries of modern architecture in presenting an image that reflects the forward-thinking creativity of the Center's programs and scientists. Building materials include travertine fieldstone, green-tinted glazing, and metal panels at mullions and spandrels. The transparency of the office component of the building will allow it to shine at night as a beacon for people approaching the campus.

In response to a question by Regent Johnson, Mr. Wiesenthal explained that the exhaust stacks required for biomedical research laboratories have been organized to form an architectural feature. He explained also that there is a setback requirement along the north edge of the campus for buildings that front Mission Bay Boulevard South. Recessed buildings echo the gateway at the north and south ends of Fourth Street, the one through street. The remaining buildings have a setback at the third-floor level.

8. **STUDENT COMMONS EXPANSION, RIVERSIDE CAMPUS**

Assistant Vice Chancellor Johnson, Associate Director Chiu, and Project Manager McGinnis presented an update on the Student Commons Expansion project, which will be brought forward for action at the next meeting. Mr. Johnson recalled that the project consists of a phased demolition of the existing facility, the construction of a new student commons complex, and the renovation of Costo Hall, at a cost of $53 million. He stated that the existing commons features Carillon Mall, the bell tower, academic buildings, and the campus bookstore. The mall serves as the axis for green space on the campus.

As part of the project, the facility's cafeteria, conference rooms, commons complex, and offices will be subject to phased demolition. The new buildout will consist of an activity center, coffee pavilion, and the renovated Costo Hall. Arcades and outdoor dining areas will be incorporated into the project. The site will be accessible through various approaches. The project will include an event plaza to accommodate up to 1,000 people. A bridge will facilitate access to an amphitheater.

Mr. Johnson reported that the main building has three levels, Costo Hall has two levels, and the activity center has one level. The buildings will house food services, student program space, retail space, recreational space, conference rooms, and offices. The main building material will be UCR brick, complemented by stucco. On the south end, adjacent to Carillon Mall, a student lounge will provide a beacon of light to draw attention to the activities there.

Regent Montoya asked why Costo Hall could not be refurbished. Mr. Johnson responded that the campus has grown to such a degree that the building is too small and cannot accommodate the present complexity of uses. The cost to renovate it was judged to be prohibitive. Associate Director Chiu recalled that the commons was built in 1960 and remodeled in 1990. The Student Commons Expansion project was approved by a student

referendum with the understanding that student fees would increase by $90 per quarter at the conclusion of construction.

Regent-designate Anderson asked how the availability of space would change with the project. Mr. McGinnis responded that the space for some student activities would nearly double in size and that meeting and conference space would be available to them for the first time.

Regent Montoya asked about the plans for retail space. Mr. Johnson responded that along with the bookstore, the activity center will house stores that cater to students.

9. **BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES 3, IRVINE CAMPUS**

Vice Chancellor Brase reported that the design of the Biological Sciences 3 project would be presented for action at the next meeting. He presented slides of the project, which houses laboratories, a vivarium, and a large lecture hall. The School of Biological Sciences is located on the west side of the main campus. It is surrounded by Steinhaus Hall, the Bonney Center, the science library, McGaugh Hall, and Natural Sciences 1. The project will assume a prime position on the Ring Mall where it intersects with a pedestrian spoke.

The School of Biological Sciences buildings reflect a mix of styles. Steinhaus Hall is characteristic of Prairie Style: it is an impersonal pre-cast concrete structure set on a podium, with no detail identifying its entrances. By comparison, the latest building in the school, Natural Sciences 1, reflects design principles adopted in 1992 and conforms to the campus objective to contribute to a sense of place. It shares many of the design features of the nearby Humanities Building and Natural Sciences 2. McGaugh Hall does not reinforce any of the campus' design goals. The Science Library does relate to the campus philosophy regarding architectural order; however, its scale is very large, the cement plaster finish is not consistent with campus standards, and its minimal base is out of scale with the balance of the building.

The challenges in designing the Biological Sciences 3 building include the need to mediate among the surrounding architectural styles, scales, and building materials; to reinforce the relationship to the outdoor spaces; and to reflect an appropriate scale. Materials to be used for the Biological Sciences 3 project include ochre-colored concrete and green architectural metal, which tie to other colors within the school. Mr. Brase reported that the building has one floor below grade and three floors above grade. The vivarium is primarily below grade, the next two levels are laboratories and research offices, and the top level contains surge space. The laboratory space is confined to a central block, with research offices located at both ends. The primary building entry is on the south side, directly off of a plaza to be developed between the new building and Natural Sciences 1. The lecture hall is separated from the main building in order to reduce the mass of the main building. The building's structure will feature a cast-in-place concrete design. The roof will be zinc-plated. The lecture hall will incorporate integral-

colored concrete on the lower portion of its walls and textured zinc-coated steel on the upper portion. Its roof will be green metal, as will the entry trellis.

Committee Chair Marcus believed that a greater effort should be made to produce elevations that will enable the Committee members to envision the project more clearly when the project is presented again. It was agreed that the cosmetics of the lecture hall, which faces the spoke and ring crossing of the mall, merit further attention.

10. **DEVELOPMENT OF A SYSTEMWIDE SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION POLICY**

Regent Murray acknowledged the University's recent progress in developing a green building policy and energy standards. He believed that a next step was to determine how the system and the individual campuses may develop sustainability policies relative to transportation. He reported that Senior Vice President Mullinix has agreed to direct such an undertaking. Regent Murray suggested that a policy be proposed for action at the September 2005 meeting.

Senior Vice President Mullinix recalled that during the development of the University's energy efficiency and sustainability effort, concerns were raised about transportation. He believed that because the campuses differ, it is likely that policies will be developed based on best practices rather than an overall view. He envisioned that campuses would share their individual innovation and creative approaches to transportation. He hoped to engage a group of faculty, students, and Office of the President staff to address this complex issue.

Regent Montoya praised students for increasing the interest in sustainable transportation. Regent Kozberg supported the concept of sharing best practices, noting that the responses will vary among the campuses. She questioned the need for resolving to implement transportation sustainability through formal rather than informal action.

The Committee went into Closed Session at 2:30 p.m.

. . . . . .

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Attest:

Associate Secretary